## 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Ur	nited States of America,	) Case No. CR 15-006 WHA
	Plaintiff, v.	) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME ) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
. D	arell Powell	FILED
	Defendant.	) FEB U6 2015
_	•	RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Feb. b, 2015, the Court remaindes in the Speedy Trial Act from Feb. b, 2015 to Feb. 17, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):		
	Failure to grant a continuance would See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ld be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
	defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to ex	ex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact pect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial shed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
		Id deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	<del>_</del>	ld unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given mitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
7		ld unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
П	IS SO ORDERED.	
D	ATED: 2/6/2015	JOSEPH C. SPÉRO United States Chief Magistrate Judge
ST	TIPULATED: Attorney for Ipefendant	Assistant United States Attorney